How magnetism works mechanically by Miles Mathis

In all my research and theorizing, I have always insisted on a mechanical explanation. I do not allow dodges into field lines or pluses and minuses. And I have forbidden myself the luxury of attractions, since attractions are non-mechanical. Most of my work up to now has been on gravity or on charge, and I have had a good deal of success redefining those fields mechanically. I have also made some first steps in explaining the magnetic field as a force produced by the spin on photons. But I have not yet gotten around to answering the question in my title here. Magnetism causes an apparent attraction, just like gravity. How can I explain that mechanically, without attraction? To begin, let us look at the current explanation of this. Well, basically there isn't any. If you search in books or on the web, you get a lot of useful information on unpaired electrons and domains and domain alignment and field lines and so on, but you never get an explanation of the actual force. [I recommend a nice little website called coolmagnetman.com, which glosses the mainstream opinion on this very well and very thoroughly, while admitting that most of the theory of magnetism is a clean slate or a unplowed field.] If magnetism is closely related to electricity, and electricity is a movement of electrons, what movement of electrons causes an attraction of two macro-bodies? It is not as if one body is made up of protons and the other is made up of electrons, so we can't even use the naïve device of charge signs to explain it. In other words, we cannot use the little pluses and minuses on the proton and electron to explain a magnetic attraction, since one body does

not have more positive charge than the other, or more negative charge. And besides, we aren't even told what charge is, so the standard model doesn't have the tools to explain anything here mechanically. All we are shown is some field lines around a bar magnet, which prove the greater motions in the field. But what causes the motions, and what causes the lines?

We assume the greater lines in the field are lines of motion of the electrons, but what causes the electrons to move? I have shown in other papers[1] that the E/M field cannot be explained without a subfield of photons. The charge photons are not just being exchanged in some virtual manner between electrons and protons, they must be everywhere. Everywhere there is magnetism or electricity, there is a charge field of real photons driving the electrons.

This subfield used to be called the ether, but I don't call it the ether (mostly for political reasons). I *could* call it an ether, but I don't want the historical baggage attached to that term. I call it either the charge field or the foundational E/M field. The historical ether was never an ether of charge photons, so I want my field to be titled appropriately, and set apart from all historical fields, which were either non-assigned or poorly assigned. You will say that the ether has been disproved anyway, but that is not really true. The ether has been disproved in some forms, but not all forms. It has been shown that light does not travel via an ether, in the way that sound travels in the air; and it has been proved that the wave of light is not an ether wave, in the way the sound is a wave in the air. That is, light is not a field wave, and the ether is not the field of light. With all that I agree. However, it has never been proved that there is no ambient charge field. Just the reverse. We have lots of evidence for an ambient charge field, since the entire electromagnetic spectrum can be taken as a charge field. All the photons of all wavelengths,

that we already know about, can be taken as the charge field. The universe is filled with this radiation, as we know from the Cosmic Background Radiation and other sources. The coldest emptiest space is filled with the CBR and other E/M radiation. But our Solar System is very far from being cold and empty. Our near environs are bursting with photons across the spectrum. It may be that many or most of these photons have little to do with charge. Some may be too large and some may be too small. But every square inch of near space is bursting with photons, and a part of this field is certainly used as the charge field.

Admittedly, we haven't figured out which part. We can't monitor a inch of space and say, "these are charge photons and these are not." Nor I am any help in this, yet. I have no method of sifting charge photons from non-charge photons. In a previous paper[2] I have calculated an average wavelength for this charge field photon of 1.6×10^{-4}m, which would be about the size of a redshifted CBR, but I have a lot of work left to do on that. Blackbody radiation is probably the charge field, which would make the field operable over a range of wavelengths, but my blackbody research is also far from complete. My current guess is that most photons can be pressed into service of the charge field. Only really energetic photons like gamma rays or cosmic rays would be exempt, since the charge field is probably an average motion of the entire E/M field in a certain area. The electromagnetic field is an ocean, and the charge field is just the gradient of that ocean over some smaller area, caused mainly by the amount of mass in the area emitting it, but also by the kind of mass (unpaired electrons, for example).

At any rate, it is accepted by all that this electromagnetic field of photons exists. It is just that no one has thought to assign charge to it. So far it has been an ocean without a current, and I simply point out the unused current. So, our electrons are carried by this current of photons. They are carried along

by mechanical means: by bombardment. By direct contact. If the photons are moving from A to B, the electrons will move that way, too.

That motion explains the electrical part of E/M. Electricity is the linear or near-linear motion of free electrons and other quanta by a river of photons. But magnetism is caused by the spin of those same photons. In my mechanical explanation, all photons are spinning, with a real radius of spin and a real angular momentum. This spin tends to be either a clockwise or a counter-clockwise spin, so we can have either photons or anti-photons. In general, photons are emitted by matter and anti-photons are emitted by anti-matter. If we have about the same number of photons and anti-photons, the angular momenta sum to zero, and the E/M field is non-magnetic. This is what I believe is happening on the Moon and on Venus[3] and on Mars, so it is neither rare nor exotic. In fact, I predict that the Earth is more rare and more exotic, because it is mainly made of matter. Because it is mainly made of matter, its photons are mainly spinning the same way, which creates a strong magnetic field. This angular momentum is summable; and, due to the huge number of photons in the near environs, the sum is significant.

But what is summing, and how is it summing? It is known that angular momentum causes a torque. You learn this in any first-year physics class. A torque is a force at a right angle to the radius. It is a tangential or orthogonal force. In this case, tangential and orthogonal both just mean the force is at a right angle. If we let our spinning object travel, a force at the forwardmost point on the object will be orthogonal to the line of motion. Since an object moving forward would be most likely to hit another particle at or near the forwardmost point, an object moving forward is most likely to transmit angular momentum as an orthogonal force. This is why the magnetic field is orthogonal to the electrical field. One is caused by linear motion, and the

other is caused by the spin on the particle in linear motion. The forward motion of the photon causes the electrical force or field, the spin of the photon causes the magnetic force or field. With all that to work with, we now move on to explain a magnetic attraction. Many in history and some few now have claimed that magnetism and gravity are linked. Since they are the two field attractions we know of, this claim is and always has been fairly sensible. I will show that it is true, in a way, but not in the way anyone thought. Magnetism and gravity are two completely different things, fundamentally, but magnetism works by either driving the E/M field out of a small area of space between the magnets, allowing only gravity to remain, or by augmenting the angular part of the E/M field, creating a greater repulsion than before.

The mechanics of this could not be shown until the unified field was understood mechanically, which is why I am now able to explain it. My work on the unified field[4] allows me to show the basic mechanism for magnetic attraction. In a series of papers I have shown that both Newton's gravitational equation and Coulomb's electrostatic equation[5] are simple unified field equations. Both contain gravity and E/M. In Newton's equation, G is simply[6] a scaling constant between the two fields, and if we rewrite each mass as density times volume, we can apply the volume to the gravity field and the density to the E/M field. G then scales between the size of the photon and of the proton, allowing the E/M field to be integrated to the gravity field in the same equation.

Once we pull apart the equation, we find that the two fields are in vector opposition. At the foundational level, the E/M field is always repulsive, since it is caused by straight bombardment of photons. The gravity field, however, creates a pseudo-attraction. The compound field is found by subtracting the E/M field from the solo-gravity field. In large objects, the solo gravity field is

stronger, since the photon is relatively smaller; in smaller objects, the E/M field is stronger, because the photon is larger relative to the object. As we get nearer the size of the photon, the E/M field gets stronger, for reasons of size alone. Since the E/M field is always a repulsion, if we take it away, the attraction of the unified field will become greater. Yes, if we could block the charge field, attractions would increase. All objects on the surface of the Earth are in equilibrium, as regards this unified field. Each object has settled into some state where the two fields balance. If the object is not moving, it is because it has balanced the unified field and friction and all the other forces upon it. So what happens when we bring a north magnet to a south magnet? First I will tell you the result and then I will tell you the cause. The result is that the two charge fields of the two magnets meet head-on and cancel eachother: not by some mysterious field lines or by pluses and minuses, but by colliding and canceling the angular momenta of the photons. This reduces the E/M field by removing the M component of the field. Because the magnetic field and the electric field are about the same size, the E/M field is reduced by almost 50%. Since the solo gravity field is unaffected, and since we have just turned off half the repulsion, the objects come together. Magnetic attraction is not really attraction, it is a loss of half the repulsion, you see.

Before I get to the mechanical cause of this, let me answer a question that I know is on your lips. You will say, "I thought you were trying to explain this without attraction. But here you just used gravity, and gravity is an attraction." No, not in my unified field, it isn't. I have reversed all the gravitational accelerations in the universe. I have taken Einstein's equivalence principle as a physical fact, not just a mathematical reversal or a theoretical game. I have assigned[7] the acceleration of gravity to a real motion, not just a field inclination or a hovering gradient or a mathematical curve. That is to say,

all objects are expanding at a rate defined by their gravitational presence, i.e, their volume. Note that: their volume, not their mass.

I can explain magnetism mechanically, without attraction, only because I can explain gravity mechanically, without attraction. If you entered my site on this paper, you have joined us in the middle of the movie. You have to read my papers on gravity[7] and on unification[4] before any of this makes sense.
Now, how do the photons actually cancel half the field, and why do they cancel it in the case of magnets, but not in the case of normal objects? When we bring two objects together, they do not normally interact this way, creating a charge vacuum and a significantly increased gravitational bond, do they? Since I have claimed that all objects emit the charge field, why don't all objects act like magnets? Also, why do repulsing magnets repulse?

When magnets meet, they do not need to have stronger charge fields or extraordinary charge fields, or anything else. They only need to have charge fields that are ordered in a particular way. This is already known, in a way, since we know that the domains have to all be aligned by some external magnetic field. If they aren't, the magnet won't work or won't have its full strength. This was known, but it wasn't known precisely what was aligning. Up to now, it was thought that it was something to do with electric current, but it isn't. The electric current in a magnet and around a magnet is an *effect* of the alignment, not the cause of it. What is actually aligning is the charge field. It is not unpaired electrons creating alignment either, it is the nucleus. The nucleus is channeling charge, and with certain elements the nuclear poles align, creating magnetic conduction. See my recent paper on Iron for more on this.

In short, with magnetic attraction, we have two opposite spin fields meeting,

and these fields are a creation of the nucleus. Some elements create much stronger spin fields via magnetic conduction through the nuclear pole, and these elements are the most magnetic. When these strong spin fields meet from opposing directions, we get high spin cancellations. When the two charge fields meet in fairly well-ordered straight lines, head-to-head, the photons will cancel their spins, canceling the magnetic component of the E/M field. The photons will not annihilate one another, but they will annihilate one another's spins. In other words, the electrical field will not be canceled, only the magnetic field. Nor will all photons be affected, since we don't imagine that all will collide. But the field coherence creates an unusually high number of collisions and spin cancellations, and the result is greatly reduced charge field. A greatly reduced charge field is the same as a greatly strengthened gravity field, and the result is an apparent attraction. There is too little repulsion to counteract gravitational expansion, and the magnets come together. My critic will now say, "Very good, but now explain a north pole meeting a north pole. You haven't shown anything but a object emitting a field, so how can you explain both attraction and repulsion with a coherent, emitted, positive field of real photons?"

Quite easily, actually. Just look how you change the situation: you turn one of your magnets 180 degrees. Or, **you have turned your macro-object upside-down**. Just by doing that, you have turned all your quanta upside-down as well. All your electrons are upside-down, compared to where they were before, and all your emitted photons have just been reversed as well. They are upside down, compared to the attracting magnets, so they will now act in the reverse way. In other words, they are spinning the other way. If all the photons in magnet A were spinning clockwise relative to B, they are now spinning counter-clockwise relative to B. If the photons in B were spinning counter-clockwise to begin with, we now have CCW photons meeting CCW

photons. Instead of having the spins cancel, they now stack. The magnetic repulsion is at maximum strength, since the torque at the front of each photon is added to the other. Instead of torque minus torque, we now have torque plus torque. And, since the fields have been made coherent, the two torques are as close to parallel as we can make them. The addition of torques is as near a straight doubling as it can be.

Consider this illustration. If two CCW photons meet from opposite directions, their spins add, as when two cars meet head-on. The linear motions are head-on, and so are the torques. In this case, opposite vectors do not cancel, they add. But if a CCW photon meets a CW photon, their spins cancel (or fail to add) as when two cars side-swipe. And this is why normal objects don't act like magnets. One: they don't have the right elemental structure, and since it is the nucleus that creates the possibility of magnetism, these objects won't have the magnetic conduction through the nuclear pole. Two: because they don't have this inherent charge-field spin, they can't be made coherent by an external magnetic field. There is much less to cohere. Three: when the charge fields of two normal objects meet, the magnetic component of the charge field is neither at a maximum or a minimum. We get all sorts of random meetings of photons, and we get the sort of flabby magnetic repulsion that most objects have for one another: a repulsion large enough to counteract gravity, but not enough to take it well above or below normal.

It is not that most objects are not magnetic. It is that most objects are magnetic near the same average, repulsing one another with a magnetic strength that we may take to be about halfway between a repulsing magnet and an attracting magnet. In other words, if we take the maximum angular repulsion to be 1 and the minimum to be 0, most objects repulse one another at .5. The photons don't meet in a coherent manner, so that the spins can

neither stack properly nor cancel properly. Think of it as if every meeting is sort of a 45^{o} hit. The spin stacking has an efficiency of about 50%. So if our normal magnetic field is at .5, and our electric repulsion is at 1, we imagine our solo gravity field has a strength of 1.5, and the three cancel, creating no appreciable force. But with a fully performing magnet, the magnetic field is either at 0 or 1, which makes the total E/M repulsion either 1 or 2. If the solo gravity field is constant at 1.5, then the magnets will either repel at .5 or attract at .5. That is a simplification, but it shows you the rough method. This is also why turning normal objects upside down or reversing them doesn't change them magnetically. If 50% were stacking and 50% were canceling in situation one, then you can't change that by going to situation two, where everything is reversed. A complete reversal of 50/50 is still 50/50. With magnets, the magnetic field is extremely variable. It does not sum anywhere near 50%. It tends to sum nearer 0 or nearer 100%, for the mechanical reason I just described. Therefore it causes either a repulsion or an attraction we can feel and measure. But in neither case are we feeling only an E/M field attraction or repulsion. What we are feeling is a large swing in the unified field, caused by that variance in the magnetic field. A critic will be shocked to see me creating a field reversal simply by turning my object over, but anyone who has actually worked with magnets will know that this is how they operate. Magnets are actually very finicky about turning over (see below), and you have to reverse them in the correct ways. I have just shown you the mechanical reason for that: you can reverse a magnet just by turning it, because you can reverse a spin just by turning it over. Yes, you can make a photon act like an antiphoton just by turning it upside-down.

[What I have just revealed to you is a broad generalization, and it always applies to the charge field, but in some cases it is an oversimplification. Don't imagine that I am saying that all anti-protons are just upside-down protons,

because I am not. In another paper[8] I have shown that we have eight different kinds of protons and eight different kinds of anti-protons, as well as four different electrons and four different positrons. So we have a lot of different possibilities. However, the main difference between particles and anti-particles is a reversed outer or z-spin, and you can reverse an outer spin relative to a charge field just by flipping the particle over. Anti-particles are not weird or esoteric, they are just a stack of reversed spins.]


This can be shown very simply with this visualization. Take two dial clocks, side-by-side. Now turn one so that they are face-to-face. They are already reversed, and they would cancel one another as a matter of angular momentum. But if we take two dial clocks and turn them head-to-head, they are both still spinning clockwise, and would not cancel. So the direction of spin is very important (see below for more on this).


My critic will say that we can't just turn a bar magnet over to reverse it: we have to reverse the ends. He will ask why one reversal creates a field reversal, but the other reversal doesn't. Well, no one else can explain it mechanically, but I can. All we need to show it is a gyroscope with a top tag on it, as pictured. In the first picture, we are looking at the front of the gyroscope, and see the F tag. In the second picture, we are looking at the back of the gyroscope, and see the B tag. But as regards spin, no difference. If you flip a gyroscope like that, nothing will change. To get a change, you have to flip it the other way, top to bottom. That is how spins work. A flip in one direction will give you no change; a flip in the other direction will give you a complete change. The same thing can be seen with a dial clock. If you hold up a desk clock and look at it from underneath, as pictured, you will see it going clockwise. If you now turn it upside-down and look at it from above, it is still going clockwise. You have flipped it and gotten no spin change. But if you flip it the other way, so that the face is away from you, you will have a complete

spin change. If the back of the clock were transparent, you would see a counter-clockwise motion of the hands. That is what is happening with a magnet. If you flip the ends of a bar magnet, you get a complete field reversal. If you just turn the bar magnet over, you don't. A circular refrigerator magnet works differently. In one position, the two magnets attract, face-to-face. But you can keep them face-to-face and just turn one 180 degrees: they now repel. You have turned the photons over.

Spin is a large part of the solution of magnetism, and I have just shown you the mechanical reason why. This is also why the standard model has not been able to explain magnetism. The standard model refuses to assign real spin to either photons or electrons or anything else. All the spins in QED are mechanically unassigned, since we are told we are dealing with point particles and intrinsic spins. We are actually *forbidden* from giving them real size or real spins or from thinking of them in physical ways. I am not sure why, except to prevent outsiders from getting ahead of the thick-headed particle physicists who prefer to assign things to color and charm and strangeness.

Now, I will finish by answering some other questions. It is known that a magnet's strength can be increased or induced by an electric field. This is called an electromagnet. My critic will ask how my situation above could be increased. Haven't I just turned off the spin of the photons, maximizing the solo-gravity field? If it is maximized, how can the attraction be increased even further? This is not hard to answer, either, since my situation above didn't really maximize much of anything. The only thing I maximized was the coherence, so that the forward torques would be as near parallel as possible. But there are many other factors that can be "maximized" beyond that. For example, in the gap between objects, we will always have a large amount of cross traffic, caused by rogue photons and other quanta. Even if we assume

that the charge field has an average direction caused by the masses in the area, that will always just be an average. In reality, we always have a large amount of cross traffic, and that must diminish the efficiency of the charge repulsion between the objects. In fact, that is what causes the "snap" when magnets come together. Unlike gravity, the force of magnetism has a big flux right at the end. For instance, if you lift your foot off the ground, you do not feel a big tug just as you break contact, and a much lesser tug at 2 inches. No, gravity is a constant in that situation, and this is because solo-gravity is not a particle field. It is a real acceleration, not a field of bombardment. Particles in the gap can't affect it. But magnets have a strong bond at contact, and a much weaker attraction as soon as contact is broken. One cause of this is that as soon as contact is broken, the cross-traffic field rushes back in, greatly diminishing the efficiency of the torque meetings. Rogue photons come in from both sides and stir things up. No matter how coherent our fields emitted from the two magnets may be, the gap is not just filled by that emission. It is filled by emission from everywhere. So even a coherent emitted field will be much less than perfectly efficient. But when the magnets actually touch, this cross-traffic is very greatly decreased, all at once. The molecules exclude them. Since even solid structures are very porous, we will still have photon cross traffic inside the magnet, but we will have much less cross traffic than in the gap. That is what causes the snap. Now, if we want to increase the magnetic "attraction", we must decrease the charge repulsion even further, and we can do that by excluding more and more of this rogue photon wind, both inside and outside the magnets. That is what an electric current will do. In an electromagnet, we apply a current to increase the magnetism. Is it the electrons that do this? Not really. They help, of course, since they clear cross-traffic, too. And they also emit spinning photons, so the more free electrons we have, the better. But the main difference is the increase in the charge field we get. Any addition of electricity is also an addition of charge. In other

words, when you add a bunch of free electrons, you are also adding all the photons that are carrying those electrons. When you input electricity, you greatly increase the density of your charge field. This increases your number of collisions, and not only further diminishes the angular momentum of the emitted field, it also excludes an external field. It clears out the gap, and also clears rogue photons out of the magnets themselves. Because the charge field running through the magnets and in the gap is denser, the cross traffic is better excluded. This takes our summed angular momentum closer to zero, in the case of attraction, or closer to 2, in the case of repulsion. In other words, it makes the magnets work better and makes the force greater. Another subtlety of all this that has been missed by history is that what I am calling "earthly" objects inhabit a unique place in the unified field. I already mentioned in passing above that large objects like planets and stars have stronger solo gravity fields than E/M fields, and that small objects like quanta have stronger E/M fields and weaker gravity fields. Since the standard model already knows that, most people will have run over my statement without pausing. But it deserves much more study than that. I have already pointed out the reason for it, and that alone is worthy of some attention. I told you above that the reason was because quanta are nearer in size to photons. Because the moved particles are nearer in size to the moving particles, the E/M field is stronger for small particles. Larger objects feel less E/M repulsion, as a fraction of the unified field, simply because the photons are smaller relative to them. The Earth is very large relative to a photon, so it can shrug off the bombardment easier than a proton or a ball bearing can. That statement is so obvious that most will still not see its import. What is important about it is that the standard model has ignored it. The standard model does not create any forces with real mechanics or collisions, so all of this must be meaningless for it. Yes, the standard model uses Planck′s constant as its field quantum, and since I have shown that Planck′s constant is

just 2400 times the mass of the charge photon, they basically have the same field quantum I do. Problem is, they don't know that. They don't give their photons any mass or spin. Nor do they understand that Planck's constant is hiding a mass. Most importantly, they don't give the charge field any presence above the quantum level. They do not admit that the charge field is a measurable part of macro-forces, or that it is part of what we now call gravity. They do not admit that it is a player in celestial mechanics. So they have completely missed what I am about to tell you. If the E/M field is larger at small scales and solo-gravity is larger at large scales, then there must be some scale where they are equal. It turns out that this scale is the scale of earthly objects. It is the scale of humans and houses, roughly. It was in my paper on the Moon that I first recognized this. I showed that the Earth's charge field is .009545, compared to its gravity field of 9.81. The Earth's charge field is about .1% of its unified field. But with the Moon, we already see a big difference in that percentage. The Moon's charge field is 1 and its solo-gravity field is 2.67, so its charge field is 27% of its unified field. That's a big change. We moved from the size of the Earth to the size of the Moon, and found that much difference in the unified field. Then, in my Cavendish paper, I calculated the unified field for his experiment, finding that for his balls, the solo-gravity field had fallen below the E/M field, being only 35% of the unified field. The size of field equality is just above that, at the size of about 1 meter. This is one of the major reasons that we see such stability at our own size level. We assume that this sort of stability is normal in the universe, but it it isn't. At the size of planets and stars, we don't see this stability, which is why planets and stars are less stable. You don't see planets and stars sitting around next to one another, completely still. Large objects are always rushing around in orbits, trying to maintain stability that way. The same can be said for very small objects like quanta. We never see them sitting around next to eachother, like rocks or chairs. They are always rushing about, crashing into one another, or

trying to maintain orbits. You may think that objects at our own size are stable due mainly to friction, or to the gravity field of the Earth, but that is only partially true. In most cases, neither gravity nor friction (nor air pressure) can explain the stability of earthly objects. What explains it is a balancing of gravity and E/M. It is not an accident that life happens to exist at this size level, either. Life requires this sort of stability, and so we would expect it to exist at the size level where gravity and E/M offset. Before now, it has never been explained why life forms should be expected to exist near 1 meter, instead of nearer the quantum level or the stellar level, but this is the reason. Yes, it would be difficult for life composed of molecules to exist below the molecular level, and it would be difficult for life that requires water or oxygen or any other molecules to exist as planets floating in space, but those commonsensical answers are not the whole story. Life also requires stability. It requires freedom from constant collision (on the small side), and freedom from the requirement of orbiting (on the large side). So even without these other considerations, we would expect to find life existing near the point of balance of gravity and E/M. One final round of comment before I end. I have explained many things, but have many things left to explain. My analysis of magnetism is just a beginning, and is simply a signpost to a fuller explanation. The biggest problem I currently have is explaining the great strength of magnets. It would appear at a first glance that magnets are much stronger than can be accounted for by linking magnetism to gravity. But this is answered by realizing that elements that are more magnetic will have a different initial balance with gravity than elements that are not. Take a bit of magnetized iron, as an example. If it is initially in a position of no forces, this will be because it is in balance with the local unified field. It has balanced gravity with its own magnetic field, and that is why it is not moving and not causing things around it to move. But now we introduce other objects, which we find are attracted or repelled by this iron. What is happening? The field

spins are stacking or cancelling. And since iron has a strong field, there is more to stack or cancel. In other words, with objects of high magnetism, the charge component of the unifed field is larger both absolutely and as a fraction of the total field. So stronger magnets are stacking or cancelling larger fields. It is that simple. Notice that this also explains how magnetism can actually be stronger than gravity. I have shown that gravity on the Earth is a unified field, and that the number we have 9.8 is a unified field number. We find that number by subtracting charge from the solo gravity pseudo-attraction. Well, in the case of strong magnets, the charge force is stronger than solo gravity to start with. There is nothing stopping us from proposing that. So in the case of such magnets, we would calculate their own unifed field by subtracting solo gravity from charge, rather than charge from solo gravity. You subtract the lesser value from the greater. The magnet then seeks a position relative to other objects to maintain balance in that field. In regard to its position on the Earth, the magnet doesn't have to do the magnetic subtraction, since the Earth is only weakly magnetic. Therefore the weight of the magnet is not affected by its magnetism (much). Only the magnet's position relative to other magnets will be affected.

You may now consult my newer paper on magnetism, where I show how it is mechanically created in the nucleus, with full diagrams and explanations.

[1] Mathis, Miles. *What is Charge?* 2008.

[2] Mathis, Miles. *Hubble Redshifts and the Cosmic Background Radiation.* 2010.

[3] Mathis, Miles. *The E/M Fields of Solar System Bodies.* 2009.

[4] Mathis, Miles. *The Unified Field.* 2007.

[5] Mathis, Miles. *Coulomb's Equation.* 2009.

[6] Mathis, Miles. *What is G?.* 2008.

[7] Mathis, Miles. *The Third Wave: a Redefinition of Gravity.* 2004.

[8] Mathis, Miles. *A Reworking of Quantum Chromodynamics.* 2008.

[9] Mathis, Miles. *Gravity at the Quantum Level.* 2009.

If this paper was useful to you in any way, please consider donating a dollar (or more) to the SAVE THE ARTISTS FOUNDATION. This will allow me to continue writing these "unpublishable" things. I have joined the boycott against Paypal, and suggest you use Amazon instead. It is free and does not enrich any bankers. AMAZON WEBPAYdonate from your cellphone or computer

donate to mm@milesmathis.com.

---

http://milesmathis.com/magnet.html